



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PL  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,723	02/25/2002	Nigel D. Young	GB010051	8250
24737	7590	10/29/2003	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			MANDALA, VICTOR A	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2826	

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/084,723	YOUNG, NIGEL D.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Victor A Mandala Jr.	2826	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NATHAN J. FLYNN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on 04 September 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth above.  
 2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
 (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
 (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
 6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
 7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant continues to argue that the prior art of record, U.S. Patent No. 6,323,832 Nishizawa et al., does not teach the claimed matter in claims 1 and 2. The examiner has considered the applicant's arguments, but finds them to be non-persuasive. The Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach a pixel electrode coupled to a semiconductor device and bases the arguments on the Applicant's disclosure but not on the claimed structure , which the disclosure is specific to a TFT and LCD pixel device. Since the independent claims do not specifically claim and refer to the Applicant's disclosed device, the arguments are found to be non-persuasive on this basis and the claims will be interpreted in the broadest view. Nishizawa et al. teaches a matrix array of leds, (semiconductor devices), which each of the leds in the array are an individual pixel amoungst the array as a whole and are coupled together by wires, (pixel electrodes, wherein electrodes are used to electrically couple devices together). The claim language does not teach the pixel electrode to be defined by the specific and narrowed art of TFTs and LCDs, which would allow one having skill in the art to interpret the term pixel electrode in a broader scope as described above. The rejections filed on 6/02/03 stand as is .